

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration in view of the previous amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-32 are pending. The claims are amended to correct informalities.

The Examiner objects to the drawings. The drawings are replaced to satisfy the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 5, 6, 8-13, 16, 18, 22, and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Claims 5, 6, 8-12, 16, 18, 22 and 24 are amended to address the Examiner's concerns. With respect to claims 12 and 13 the Examiner asks how is strength measured. In response, claims 12 and 13 each recite the fiber bundle having a higher strength relative to or compared to the longitudinal fibers. Thus, Applicant does not believe that how strength is measured is relevant. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U. S. Patent No. 6,410,140 to Land et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claim 1 is directed to a rope-like structure comprising longitudinal fibers of a longitudinal fiber structure. At least one other fiber which lies transversely to the longitudinal fibers essentially with a different angle, is bound to the longitudinal fibers of the longitudinal fiber structure, or another fiber bundle is attached around the longitudinal fibers, such that the latter are mutually slip proof and essentially immovable. In this way, the longitudinal fibers may be held fast.

Such features encompass Applicant's exemplary embodiment as illustrated in Fig. 1 wherein core rope 10 has an inner core area 1 and a jacket area 2 which surrounds the inner core area 1. The core area 1 includes at least one core 3 which

is formed from a host of fibers, yarns, yarn strands and/or at least one cord which are designated as a core fiber structure 5. At least one other fiber 50 lies essentially transversely to the longitudinal fiber structure 40 which includes core fiber structures 5 and jacket fiber structure 6. The at least one other fiber 50 is bound to the longitudinal fibers in the longitudinal fiber structure 40 so that the longitudinal fibers are unable to slip against one another or to slip mutually together. In an exemplary embodiment shown in Fig. 2 individual yarn strands are surrounded or bound with the at least one other fiber 50.

This combination of features is not disclosed by the Land patent. Instead, the Land patent discloses synthetic filaments 108, 110 of a core 1,2 extend generally longitudinally in an axial direction of a double core spun yarn 100. The majority of the staple fibers of the first sheath 104 and of a second sheath 106 extend around core 102 in a slightly spiral direction. A minor portion of the staple fibers of each of the sheaths form a binding wrapper spirally around the majority of staple fibers, as indicated at 112, in a direction opposite the majority of staple fibers. The Land patent does not provide any mention of an at least one other fiber, or another fiber bundle, which is provided so that the longitudinal fibers are mutually slip proof. In Land, the provision of an air spinning procedure for staple fibers results in a product which does not have claim 1's claimed combination of features, in particular, longitudinal fibers that are mutually slip proof. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-32 over the Land patent is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-32 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 7,360,477 to Hess. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Hess patent provides a kernmantel rope 20 having an inner core region 1, a surrounding sheath region 2, at least one core 3 with core fibers 5 and a sheath 4 with sheath fiber 6. Hess provides no disclosure of at least one other fiber which lies transversely to the longitudinal fibers essentially with a different angle wherein the at least one other fiber is bound to the longitudinal fibers of the longitudinal fiber structure or another fiber bundle which is attached around the longitudinal fiber such that the latter are mutually slip proof and essentially movable as in Applicant's independent claim 1.


The Examiner states that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each teaches a core/sheath rope-like structure with an amount of fibers binding the core of the sheath. However, as stated above, the Hess patent does not disclose at least one other fiber which lies transversely to the longitudinal fibers essentially with a different angle wherein the at least one other fiber is bound to the longitudinal fibers of the longitudinal fiber. Nor has the Examiner provided any explanation of why the ordinarily skilled artisan would provide this feature in the Hess patent rope. Withdrawal of the obviousness type-double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 27, 2010
By: 
Michael Britton
Registration No. 47260

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620